

REMARKS

Claims 4-9, 15-21 and 31-34 have been examined and rejected on prior art grounds. Applicants hereby add claims 35-47 to rejoin claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 13, 14, 22-26, 28, and 29 previously canceled from the application. Hence, claims 4-9, 15-21, and 31-47 are all the claims pending in the application.

Statement of Substance of Interview

Applicants' representative, Sean M. Conner, conducted a telephone interview with Examiner Ajay Bhatia on December 23, 2008. Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview.

During the interview, Applicants' representative discussed the differences between Smith et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,578,078) and the present invention, as defined by proposed amendments to claims 4 and 15. In order to expedite prosecution, these claims are amended in accordance with the proposed amendments discussed during the interview. The Examiner acknowledged that Smith does not teach or suggest at least the newly added features of claims, as discussed below in the section entitled "Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)." Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims are patentable.

No exhibits or demonstrations were provided by Applicants' representative.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-9, 15-21, and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Smith. Applicants submit that the claims are patentable at least for the following reasons.

Claim 4, as amended, recites a method comprising, in part, sending a first request from the local server to a link checking service unit of a remote server to determine whether a first resource in the remote server corresponding to a first link in the document is located at said first link; and receiving a first response to said first request from the remote server, the first response containing an indication that the first resource is not located at the first link, wherein the remote server generates the indication by referring to a mapping table stored on the remote server to determine that the first resource is not located at the first link, wherein said mapping table stores changes that occur in locations of resources on the remote server, said first resource being among said resources.

In contrast, Smith discloses that an external server will send updated meta-data to the local server having links which point to resources on the external server, as changes occur in the resources on the external server. Using the meta-data, the local server may then perform a link fixup routine to repair the links located therein (col. 18, lines 18-62). Smith does not teach or suggest that the remote server generates the indication that the first resource is not located at the first link by referring to a mapping table stored on the remote server to determine that the first resource is not located at the first link, wherein said mapping table stores changes that occur in locations of resources on the remote server, said first resource being among said resources, as

recited in claim 4. Instead, Smith discloses that the local server uses meta-data to repair the links which point to resources on an external server.

Because Smith does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 4, Applicants submit that the claim is not anticipated by Smith. Applicants further submit that claims 5-9, 31, and 33 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 4.

Claim 15, as amended, recites a method comprising, in part, detecting, by the remote server, if the first resource is present within a storage unit at a location indicated by the first location indicator by referring to a mapping table stored on the remote server, wherein said mapping table stores changes that occur in locations of resources on the remote server, said first resource being among said resources; determining, by the remote server, if the first resource is present at an alternate location if the first resource is not detected in the location indicated by the first location indicator by referring to the mapping table; and in response to the first request, returning, by the remote server, an alternate location identifier indicating the alternate location of the first resource if the first resource is determined to be present at the alternate location.

As discussed above in conjunction with claim 4, Smith discloses that the local server uses meta-data to repair links which point to resources on an external server. Smith does not teach or suggest detecting, by the remote server, if the first resource is present within a storage unit at a location indicated by the first location indicator by referring to a mapping table stored on the remote server, wherein said mapping table stores changes that occur in locations of resources on the remote server, said first resource being among said resources; determining, by the remote server, if the first resource is present at an alternate location if the first resource is not detected in

the location indicated by the first location indicator by referring to the mapping table; and in response to the first request, returning, by the remote server, an alternate location identifier indicating the alternate location of the first resource if the first resource is determined to be present at the alternate location, as recited by claim 15.

Because Smith does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 15, Applicants submit that the claim is not anticipated by Smith. Applicants further submit that claims 16-21, 32, and 34 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 4.

New Claims

New claims 35-47 have been added.

New independent claims 35, 37, 39, and 40 recite features similar to those discussed above in conjunction with claim 4. Accordingly Applicants submit that claims 35, 37, 39, and 40 are patentable at least for reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 4. Applicants further submit that claims 36 and 38 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 35 and 37, respectively.

New independent claims 41, 46, and 47 recite features similar to those discussed above in conjunction with claim 15. Accordingly Applicants submit that claims 41, 46, and 47 are patentable at least for reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 15. Applicants further submit that claims 42-45 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 41.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

46159

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 27, 2009

/Sean M. Conner/
Sean M. Conner
Registration No. 60,840